

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION

SERAFINA LICCARDI,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
v.	§	
	§	
IAN SHORR; PARAMOUNT	§	Case No. 3:22-cv-02423-K-BT
PICTURES/VIACOM; JEFF BEZOS;	§	
AMAZON PRIME VIDEO; and	§	
AMAZON.COM WORLDWIDE	§	
DISTRIBUTION,	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	

**ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND
RECOMMENDATION OF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

The Court has under consideration the Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Rebecca Rutherford dated December 11, 2023. The Court has made a *de novo* review of those portions of the proposed Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation to which objections were made. The objections are **OVERRULED**.

The Court also warns Plaintiff that she could be subject to sanctions, including monetary sanctions and an injunction preventing her from filing additional lawsuits, if she persists in filing duplicative and vexatious lawsuits. Courts possess the inherent power “to protect the efficient and orderly administration of justice and . . . to command respect for the court’s orders, judgments, procedures, and authority.” In re

Stone, 986 F.2d 898, 902 (5th Cir. 1993) (per curiam). Included in this inherent power is “the power to levy sanctions in response to abusive litigation practices.” Id. Sanctions may be appropriate when a pro se litigant has a history of submitting multiple frivolous claims. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 11; Mendoza v. Lynaugh, 989 F.2d 191, 195-97 (5th Cir. 1993). Pro se litigants have “no license to harass others, clog the judicial machinery with meritless litigation, and abuse already overloaded court dockets.” Farguson v. MBank Hous., N.A., 808 F.2d 358, 359 (5th Cir. 1986).

Including this one, Plaintiff has filed at least five lawsuits in this District, and all of them have been dismissed upon a finding of frivolity, failure to prosecute, or failure to state a claim. See Case Nos. 3:16-cv-02537-S-BT (dismissed with prejudice with leave to amend denied on futility grounds); 3:21-cv-00314-E-BH (dismissed for failure to properly serve defendants); 3:21-cv-02590-E-BH (dismissed for failure to prosecute or comply with a court order); and 3:23-cv-00485-E-BN (dismissed with prejudice as time barred). This is Plaintiff’s third lawsuit dismissed with prejudice, and her second alleging infringement of the same material by these same defendants. The Court warns Plaintiff that if she persists in filing frivolous, duplicative, and

vexatious lawsuits, she could be subject to sanctions, including monetary sanctions and an injunction preventing her from filing additional lawsuits related to this one.

SO ORDERED.

Signed January 3rd, 2024.


ED KINKEADE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE